



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/732,854	12/11/2003	Klaus Hugi	59643.00329	9129
32294 7590 08/04/2008 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212				
EXAMINER				
CHAN, RICHARD				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/732,854

Applicant(s)

HUGL ET AL.

Examiner

RICHARD CHAN

Art Unit

2618

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-14, 16-19, 22-33, 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 15, 20 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see arguments, filed 4/30/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Rappaport (US 5,233,628)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 22, 23, and 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rappaport (US 5,233,628)

With respect to claims 1 and 38, Rappaport Fig.3 discloses in the method determining at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on estimated channel properties of at least two transmit diversity branches. Col.16 line 20-30

With respect to claim 2, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, wherein the determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity

branch for use using a transmit diversity performance indicator defined for a transmit diversity branch set, the transmit diversity performance indicator being dependent on at least estimated channel properties by channel estimator of transmit diversity branches belonging to the transmit diversity branch set. Col.16 line 20-30

Rappaport discloses wherein the features of the invention discloses a diversity approach (Col.16 line 32-34) And based on small scale fading an accurate channel model is used to predict precise bit errors. The software is further disclosing wherein it becomes possible to evaluate various baseband platforms using diversity approaches.

With respect to claim 3, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 2, wherein the determining comprises using the transmit diversity performance indicator taking into account one or more of the following: small-scale fading statistics, and specific channel coding. Col.16 line 20-34

With respect to claim 23, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, further comprising: transmitting information using transmit diversity branches selected for use. Col.16 line 20-30

With respect to claim 26, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, wherein the step of determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use for a receiver independently of other receivers. Col.16 line 20-

30

With respect to claim 27, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, wherein the step of determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for a radio link independently of other radio links employed by a transmitter. Col.16 line 20-30

With respect to claim 28, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, wherein the step of determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use for a transmitter, for use with a receiver. (Col.16 line 20-30)

With respect to claim 29, Rappaport discloses an apparatus comprising: establisher configured to establish estimated channel properties, channel estimator of at least two transmit diversity branches; and a determiner configured to determine transmit diversity branches for use based on the estimated channel properties. (Col.16 line 20-30)

With respect to claim 30, Rappaport discloses the apparatus as defined in claim 30, the network element further comprising said at least two transmit diversity branches (B0-Bn) and transmitting means for transmitting information over a radio interface using selected transmit diversity branches. (Col.7 line 10-14) and (Col.9 line 11-15)

With respect to claim 31, Rappaport discloses the apparatus as defined in claim 31, a transmitter comprising a base station of a cellular communications system. Please see abstract

With respect to claim 32, Rappaport discloses the apparatus as defined in claim 30, said network element comprising a base station controller of a cellular communications system. Please See Abstract

With respect to claim 33, Rappaport discloses the apparatus as defined in claim 31, said network element comprising an access point of a wireless local area network. Please See Abstract.

With respect to claim 35, Rappaport discloses the radio transmitter as defined in claim 29, the radio transmitter comprising a mobile station for a cellular telecommunications network. (Abstract)

With respect to claim 36, Rappaport discloses the radio transmitter as defined in claim 35, the radio transmitter comprising user equipment of a wireless local area network. (Abstract)

With respect to claim 37, Rappaport discloses establishing means for establishing estimated channel properties wof at least two transmit diversity branches;

and determining means for determining transmit diversity branches for use based on the estimated channel properties. Col.16 line 30-34

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappaport (US 5,233,628) in view of Veeravalli (US 6,097,956).

With respect to claim 4, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, however Rappaport does not specifically disclose wherein the step of determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use comprises taking into account a required outage probability.

The Veeravalli reference however discloses in Claim 2, wherein the probability of outage determines the coverage provided by the transceiver.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement taking into account the use an outage probability statistic as disclosed by Veeravalli in order to determine which transmitter branch of the Rappaport diversity system should be used.

3. Claims 5, 6, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappaport (US 6,246,861) in view of Lindell (US 5,524,275).

With respect to claim 5, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, however Rappaport does not specifically disclose wherein the step of determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on said estimated channel properties comprising expected powers of transmit diversity branches.

The Lindell reference however discloses an apparatus, which uses the expected power level P_{exp} for setting the threshold allowing the transmitter to estimate the threshold level. (Col.5 lines 35-43)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the use of expected power level value as disclosed by Lindell with the transmitted diversity system of Rappaport in order to determine threshold values that need to met by the diversity branches.

With respect to claim 6, Rappaport and Lindell combined discloses the method as defined in claim 5, Lindell continues to disclose wherein the step of determining comprises evaluating a transmit diversity performance indicator using said expected powers. (Col.5 lines 35-42)

With respect to claim 8, Rappaport and Lindell combined disclose the method as defined in claim 6, Rappaport further discloses the method comprising the steps of: evaluating said transmit diversity performance indicator for various transmit diversity branch sets and selecting for use the transmit diversity branch set having an optimum transmit diversity performance indicator value. Col.16 line 30-34

With respect to claim 10, Rappaport and Lindell combined discloses the method as defined in claim 6, Lindell continues to disclose wherein the step of determining comprises evaluating the transmit diversity performance indicator defining a branch power threshold for adding a further transmit diversity branch to a transmit diversity branch set for use, the branch power threshold P_{max} being dependent on the expected powers of the transmit diversity branches already selected to the transmit diversity branch set for use. (Col.3 lines 59 to Col.4 line 6)

With respect to claim 11, Rappaport and Lindell combined discloses the method as defined in claim 10, Lindell continues to disclose wherein the step of determining comprises selecting the transmit diversity branches to the transmit diversity branch set for use in an order in accordance with estimated expected powers. (Col.5 lines 35-42)

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappaport (US 6,246,861) in view of Lindell (US 5,524,275) in further view of Conklin (US 6,415,283).

With respect to claim 9, Rappaport and Lindell combined discloses the method as defined in claim 8, however neither reference discloses wherein the step of evaluating comprises evaluating said transmit diversity performance indicator for transmit diversity branch sets using a tree structure, a transmit diversity branch set relating to a child node having less transmit diversity branches than a transmit diversity branch set relating to a parent node of the child node.

The Conklin reference in Fig.4 however discloses child nodes using a tree structure 220 in Fig.4 to evaluate using weighted summing in order to choose the correct child node. (Col.5 lines 63- Col.6 lines 15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the tree structure as disclosed by Conklin to the Diversity transmitter system of Rappaport and Lindell in order to calculate the appropriate transmission branch to be sending out a transmission signal.

5. Claims 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappaport (US 6,246,861) in view of Mitra (US 5,956,649).

With respect to claim 12, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, however does not specifically disclose wherein the step of determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity branch for use based on the estimated

channel properties comprising second order statistics of channel coefficients of transmit diversity branches.

The Mitra reference claim 12 discloses wherein a coefficient times a second or higher order statistic of the interference signal will determine a signal path gain between the communications device and base unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement second order channel coefficient as disclosed by Mitra in order to calculate the channel the optimal transmit diversity branch to the diversity transmitter system of Messier.

With respect to claim 13, Rappaport and Mitra combined discloses the method as defined in claim 12, Mitra continues to disclose wherein the step of determining comprises evaluating a transmit diversity performance indicator using said second order statistics. Claim 12 of Mitra.

With respect to claim 14, Rappaport and Mitra combined disclose the method as defined in claim 12, Mitra continues to disclose wherein the step of determining comprises using the second order statistics comprising at least one correlation matrix calculated using estimated channel coefficients. (Col.8 lines 47-62)

With respect to claim 16, Rappaport and Mitra combined disclose the method as defined in claim 13, Rappaport further discloses the method comprising: evaluating said transmit diversity performance indicator for various transmit diversity branch sets and

selecting for use the transmit diversity branch set having an optimum transmit diversity performance indicator value. (Col.4 lines 11-20)

With respect to claim 18, Rappaport and Mitra combined disclose the method as defined in claim 12, Mitra further discloses the method comprising: constructing virtual transmit branches RF as linear combinations of physical transmit diversity branches, and wherein the estimated channel properties comprise expected powers of said virtual transmit branches. (Col.8 lines 59-63)

With respect to claim 19, Rappaport and Mitra combined disclose the method as defined in claim 18, wherein the step of constructing comprises constructing the virtual transmit branches as Eigenvectors "Perron-Frobenius" of a channel correlation matrix derived from estimated channel coefficients and expected powers of the virtual transmit branches are determined as Eigenvalues of respective Eigenvectors. (Col.10 lines 44-62)

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Rappaport (US 6,246,861) in view of Mitra (US 5,956,649) and further in view of Conklin (US 6,415,283).

With respect to claim 17, Rappaport combined disclose the method as defined in claim 16, however neither reference specifically discloses wherein the step of evaluating

comprises evaluating said transmit diversity performance indicator for transmit diversity branch sets using a tree structure, a transmit diversity branch set relating to a child node having less transmit diversity branches than a transmit diversity branch set relating to a parent node of the child node.

The Conklin reference in Fig.4 however discloses child nodes using a tree structure 220 in Fig.4 to evaluate using weighted summing in order to choose the correct child node. (Col.5 lines 63- Col.6 lines 15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the tree structure as disclosed by Conklin to the Diversity transmitter system of Rappaport and Lindell in order to calculate the appropriate transmission branch to be sending out a transmission signal.

7. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Rappaport (US 6,246,861) in view of Whinnet (US 6,317,411)

With respect to claim 24, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, further comprising: estimating channel properties using channel coefficients at a estimating channel properties using channel coefficients at a transmitter.

The Whinnet reference however discloses wherein estimating channel properties using channel coefficients at a receiver. (Col.2 lines 42-49)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the coefficient at the receiver in order to able determine the channel properties for reception to quantify the input signal strength to properly receive the highest quality signal.

With respect to claim 25, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, however does not specifically disclose wherein the method is further comprising: estimating channel properties using channel coefficients at a receiver.

The Whinnet reference however discloses wherein estimating channel properties using channel coefficients at a receiver. (Col.2 lines 42-49)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the coefficient at the receiver in order to able determine the channel properties for reception to quantify the input signal strength to properly receive the highest quality signal.

8. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over of Rappaport (US 5,233,628) in view of Brunner (US 7,039,368).

With respect to claim 22, Rappaport discloses the method as defined in claim 1, however does not specifically disclose the method further comprising: allocating transmission power evenly to physical transmit diversity branches or virtual transmit diversity branches selected for use.

Brunner however discloses wherein diversity techniques wherein power must be distributed among all the antenna elements. (Col.2 line 12-17)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the even power distribution to all the

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 7, 15, 20, and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to claim 7, Rappaport and Lindell combined disclose the method as defined in claim 6, however the prior art does not specifically disclose wherein the step of determining comprises calculating the transmit diversity performance indicator using the following formula: $12 k = F 0 m = 1 k m k$, where $F_{sub.0}$ denotes the required outage probability, $\lambda_{sub.m}$ denotes the expected power of an m-th transmit diversity branch in a transmit diversity branch set Θ , and Θ is the number of transmit diversity branch indexes in the transmit diversity branch set Θ .

With respect to claim 15, Rappaport and Mitra combined discloses the method as defined in claim 14, however the prior art does not disclose wherein the step of determining comprises calculating the transmit diversity performance indicator using the following formula: $13 = F 0 m = 1 u m$, where $F_{sub.0}$ denotes the required outage

probability, $u_{sub.m}$ denotes an m -th Eigenvalue of a correlation matrix relating to a transmit diversity branch set Θ , and $|\Theta|$ is the number of transmit diversity branch indices in the transmit diversity branch set Θ .

With respect to claim 20, Rappaport and Mitra combined disclose the method as defined in claim 18, however the prior art does not specifically disclose wherein the step of determining comprises determining the at least one transmit diversity branch using a transmit diversity performance indicator defining a branch power threshold for adding a further virtual transmit branch set for use, the branch power threshold being dependent on the expected powers of the virtual transmit branches already selected to the virtual transmit branch set for use. The prior art discloses a power threshold leveling order to designate the appropriate transmission branch, however not based on expected powers.

Claim 21 is dependent on objected claim 20.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RICHARD CHAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0570. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (9AM - 5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on (571)272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Richard Chan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Nay A. Maung/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2618